

EXHIBIT 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

CISCO SYSTEMS,)
INC.,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) No. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF (PSG)
ARISTA NETWORKS,)
INC.,)
Defendant.)

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ANTHONY J. LI

Palo Alto, CA

Monday, February 1, 2016

Volume I

Reported by: SUSAN F. MAGEE, RPR, CCRR, CLR

CSR No. 11661

JOB No. 2224600


PAGES 1-258

Page 1

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p>1 know that, Mr. Li?</p> <p>2 A. That was policy of the IETF and has been</p> <p>3 well-recited many times within the IETF.</p> <p>4 Q. Mr. Li, do you know what the parser police</p> <p>5 is?</p> <p>6 A. I believe you're referring to a mailing</p> <p>7 list within Cisco.</p> <p>8 Q. What is your understanding of the parser</p> <p>9 police?</p> <p>10 A. So this was a group of people who were</p> <p>11 selected to review, pass judgment and comment on</p> <p>12 changes to the CLI.</p> <p>13 Q. Were you a member of the parser police,</p> <p>14 Mr. Li?</p> <p>15 A. I believe I was the original instigator of</p> <p>16 the parser police and was certainly a proactive</p> <p>17 member of it.</p> <p>18 Q. And what time period were you a member of</p> <p>19 the parser police, approximately?</p> <p>20 A. From the time it was founded in the early</p> <p>21 '90s.</p> <p>22 Q. What was the purpose of the parser police?</p> <p>23 A. So Cisco's engineering culture did not</p> <p>24 provide for any mechanism for ensuring any kind of</p> <p>25 consistency of the implementation of the CLI. The</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 extending the CLI past where it had previously been.</p> <p>2 We wanted to extend it in a way that was largely</p> <p>3 consistent with prior work.</p> <p>4 Q. What would you do to try to achieve what</p> <p>5 you call the principle of least surprise?</p> <p>6 A. So we would change the syntax or the</p> <p>7 semantics of commands to the CLI -- and this</p> <p>8 includes configure commands -- to match previous</p> <p>9 semantics.</p> <p>10 Q. When you say "previous semantics," what do</p> <p>11 you -- what do you mean by "previous semantics"?</p> <p>12 A. So matching the syntax and the meaning of</p> <p>13 previous commands already in the system.</p> <p>14 Q. Besides changing the syntax to match</p> <p>15 previous semantics, is there anything else that the</p> <p>16 parser police would try to do to achieve the</p> <p>17 principle of least surprise to the customer?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I can think of.</p> <p>19 MR. WONG: Why don't we take our lunch</p> <p>20 break.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record.</p> <p>23 The time is 12:19.</p> <p>24 (Luncheon recess taken from 12:19 p.m. to</p> <p>25 1:05 p.m.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p>
<p>1 parser police was a response to that need to try to</p> <p>2 get people organized and try to ensure that other</p> <p>3 engineers had a process whereby they could submit</p> <p>4 work for review and get comments back and help us</p> <p>5 create a much more standardized CLI.</p> <p>6 Q. What do you mean by "standardized CLI"?</p> <p>7 A. So it will be helpful to the customer if</p> <p>8 the CLI operated the same or largely the same way</p> <p>9 throughout the product. Without this, we ended up</p> <p>10 with a -- different CLI commands that did radically</p> <p>11 different things yet said the same thing to the</p> <p>12 customer base, or worse, two functions that had to</p> <p>13 be performed that did largely the same thing and yet</p> <p>14 their CLI syntax was widely different.</p> <p>15 Q. Why is it helpful to the customer if the</p> <p>16 CLI operates in the same or largely the same way</p> <p>17 throughout the product?</p> <p>18 A. Again, it is useful for giving consistency</p> <p>19 which simplifies the user's experience.</p> <p>20 Q. Besides consistency to the customer, were</p> <p>21 there any other goals that the parser police had for</p> <p>22 the Cisco command line interface?</p> <p>23 A. We would try to achieve what we called</p> <p>24 principle of least surprise. We would try to give a</p> <p>25 design that a user would expect. Frequently we were</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p>	<p>1 AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS :</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>4 record. The time is 1:05.</p> <p>5 BY MR. WONG: Q. Mr. Li, before -- before</p> <p>6 the break when you were talking about your time at</p> <p>7 USC, you mentioned that you did some Cisco training?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you recall if Cisco paid for that</p> <p>10 training?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know who paid for it. It was</p> <p>12 either Cisco or another regional network known as</p> <p>13 Surfnets or the other regional network known as</p> <p>14 Los Gatos.</p> <p>15 Q. Now, we were talking about the parser</p> <p>16 police before the break.</p> <p>17 To what extent, if at all, was the use of</p> <p>18 industry-standard terminology encouraged in Cisco's</p> <p>19 command sets?</p> <p>20 MR. PAK: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: So the use of</p> <p>22 industry-standard terminology was encouraged largely</p> <p>23 by the engineering community of which much of</p> <p>24 Cisco's development was driven by simply because it</p> <p>25 minimized confusion. It was discouraged by the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p>

<p>1 standards organization like IETF?</p> <p>2 A. I have never seen anyone do that. I have</p> <p>3 never seen Cisco have any UI patents; so I don't</p> <p>4 understand.</p> <p>5 Q. Mr. Li, is there any other views or</p> <p>6 opinions that you have with respect to this case</p> <p>7 that you have not shared with us on the record that</p> <p>8 you would like to share with us now?</p> <p>9 MR. WONG: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I don't understand your</p> <p>11 question.</p> <p>12 BY MR. PAK: Q. We talked about a lot of</p> <p>13 different topics. I'm giving you the opportunity to</p> <p>14 provide any further testimony that you would like on</p> <p>15 any of these topics if you'd like it.</p> <p>16 A. So I don't understand what intellectual</p> <p>17 property people think there is in some CLI syntax.</p> <p>18 The intellectual property is -- that's of</p> <p>19 significance gets covered in patents. If we thought</p> <p>20 it was worth protecting, we would copyright it. We</p> <p>21 would patent it.</p> <p>22 MR. WONG: Object to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 BY MR. PAK: Q. Do you believe that</p> <p>25 copyright is a form of intellectual property?</p> <p>Page 254</p>	<p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This marks the</p> <p>2 end of DVD No. 4 in the deposition of Anthony Li.</p> <p>3 Going off the record. The time is 4:17.</p> <p>4 (TIME NOTED: 4:17 p.m.)</p> <p>5 --o0o--</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>Page 256</p>
<p>1 MR. WONG: Objection. Calls for opinion</p> <p>2 testimony.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: It calls for legal testimony.</p> <p>4 I don't understand.</p> <p>5 BY MR. PAK: Q. What is your understanding</p> <p>6 of copyright law?</p> <p>7 MR. WONG: Same objection.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Vague as best.</p> <p>9 BY MR. PAK: Q. I take it, sir, that you</p> <p>10 haven't analyzed any copyright laws relating to</p> <p>11 interface, APIs, user interfaces?</p> <p>12 A. I know that I'm supposed to put a copyright</p> <p>13 notice in the top of every source code file. That's</p> <p>14 about all I know.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay.</p> <p>16 A. I can't even tell you for certain what I'm</p> <p>17 supposed to put in the top of the file because</p> <p>18 nobody can tell me exactly how I should deal with</p> <p>19 multiple years.</p> <p>20 MR. PAK: Thank you. Sir, I think those</p> <p>21 are the questions I have for you today.</p> <p>22 MR. WONG: I have no further questions.</p> <p>23 ////</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>Page 255</p>	<p>1 I, ANTHONY J. LI, do hereby declare under</p> <p>2 penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing</p> <p>3 transcript; that I have made any corrections as appear</p> <p>4 noted, in ink, initialed by me, or attached hereto; that</p> <p>5 my testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true</p> <p>6 and correct.</p> <p>7 Executed this _____ day of _____,</p> <p>8 2016, at _____, _____.</p> <p>9 (city) (state)</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 _____</p> <p>16 ANTHONY J. LI</p> <p>17 Volume I</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>Page 257</p>

<p>1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand 2 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby 3 certify: 4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken 5 before me at the time and place herein set forth; 6 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, 7 prior to testifying, were administered an oath; that 8 a record of the proceedings was made by me using 9 machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed 10 under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is 11 a true record of the testimony given. 12 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to 13 the original transcript of a deposition in a Federal 14 Case, before completion of the proceedings, review 15 of the transcript [X] was [] was not requested. 16 I further certify I am neither financially 17 interested in the action nor a relative or employee 18 of any attorney or any party to this action. 19 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date 20 subscribed my name. 21 Dated: February 3, 2016 22 23 24  Susan F. Magee 25 CSR No. 11661, RPR, CCRR, CLR</p>	

Page 258